

REMARKS

102 Rejection

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 18-22, 24-25 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pallman. Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 18-22, 24-25 and 28-32. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth:

A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of: initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system; verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system; accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; and issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 4-9, 11 and 13-14 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 18-22 and 24 depend from independent Claim 15, and Claims 28-32 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet including the step of “issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.”

Pallman only discloses a method and apparatus for data communication. The Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). The Pallman reference discusses data communications operations that are performed *by* a software program while Applicants' Claim 1 is drawn to a data communication operation performed *on* a software program (downloading it). Nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught that software located on a remote system may be downloaded to the local system as is set forth in Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Independent Claims 1, 15 and 25 and as such, Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 4-9, 11 and 13-14 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 18-22 and 24 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 28-32 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 4-9, 11, 13-14, 18-22, 24 and 28-32 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

103 Rejection

Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum et al. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Pallman reference nor the Blum et al. reference alone or in combination teach or suggest

the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth:

A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of: initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system; verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system; accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; and issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-3 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 16-17 depend from independent Claim 15, and Claims 26-27 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Blum et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman. Blum et al. alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet including the step of “issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.” Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications. The Blum reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication. Nowhere in the Blum

et al. reference is it taught that software located on a remote system may be downloaded to the local system as is set forth in Applicants' Claims 1, 15, and 25. Consequently, Pallman and Blum et al., alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as is set forth in Applicants Claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25, and thus Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-3 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 16-17 dependent on Claim 15 and Claims 26-27 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Bowman-Amuah. Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Pallman reference nor the Bowman-Amuah reference alone or in combination teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 10 and 23. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth:

A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of: initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system; verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system; accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; and issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system.

wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.

Claim 15 recites limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 10 and 23 depend from independent Claims 1 and 15 respectively and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Bowman-Amuah does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman. Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet including the step of “issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.” Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught that software located on a remote system may be downloaded to the local system as is set forth in Applicants’ Claims 1 and 15. Consequently, Pallman and Bowman-Amuah, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as is set forth in Applicants’ Claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1 and 15, and thus Claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 10 dependent on Claim 1 and

Claim 23 dependent on Claim 15, and that Claims 10 and 23 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Sridhar et al. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Pallman reference nor the Sridhar et al. reference alone or in combination teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claim 12. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth:

A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of: initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system; verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system; accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; and issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.

Claim 12 depends from independent Claims 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Sridhar et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman. Sridhar et al. alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet including the step of “issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.” Sridhar et al. only discloses an enhanced network communication system where

client and server communications systems are coupled over a data network. Nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught that software located on a remote system may be downloaded to a local system as is set forth in Applicants' Claims 1. Consequently, Pallman and Sridhar et al., either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as is set forth in Applicants' Claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Sridhar et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and thus Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Sridhar et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 12 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claim 12 traverses the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 9/2, 2002


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 38,098

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

CLAIMS

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Please amend the following Claims as shown below:

1. (Amended)A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system;

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system;

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system;

executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system[.]; and

issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.

¹⁵
~~16.~~ (Amended)A server computer comprising:
an IP port which accepts FTP commands from a client computer system;

a processor coupled to the processor which executes the FTP commands;

a first memory coupled to the processor which contains a file system; and

a first memory coupled to the processor for storing an operating system, wherein the remote user issuing the FTP commands from the client computer can administer the file system[.], wherein the IP port accepts a single script from the client computer system which causes the server computer to download a computer program from the server computer to the client computer system.

25
26.

(Amended) A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for implementing a remote computer systems management through an FTP Internet connection, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system;

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system;

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system;

executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the

remote system[.]; and

issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program.